

Practitioner's Docket No. MI22-1921

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERMAR 31 2004
OFFICIAL

In re application of: Tran, Luan C.

Application No.: 10/071,453

Group No.: 2813

Filed: 02/08/02

Examiner: L.M. Schillinge

For: A Plurality of Transistors Having Different Active Area Widths and Different Threshold Voltages
Defined by STI (As Amended)Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the following papers are being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and
Trademark Office at (703) 872-9306 on the date shown below:

Examiner Interview Summary of March 24 and 25, 2004

March 31, 2004
Date

Robin Saldivia


SignatureTotal Pages 4

(Certification of Facsimile Transmission—page 1 of 1)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No. 10/071,453
Filing Date February 8, 2002
Inventor Luan C. Tran
Assignee Micron Technology, Inc.
Group Art Unit 2813
Examiner L.M. Schillinger
Attorney's Docket No. MI22-1921
Title: A Plurality of Transistors Having Different Active Area Widths and Different
Threshold Voltages Defined by STI (As Amended)

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY OF MARCH 24 and 25, 2004

MAR 31 2004

To: Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

OFFICIAL

From: D. Brent Kenady
Tel. 509-624-4276; Fax 509-838-3424
Wells St. John P.S.
601 West First Avenue, Suite 1300
Spokane, WA 99201-3828

Applicant's representative held an interview with Examiner Schillinger on March 24, 2004. Applicant's representative would like to thank Examiner Schillinger for her time and attention to this matter.

First, the Examiner's response to Applicant's arguments presented on pages 8-9 of paper 17 were discussed.

The Examiner states: "based upon the grammar of the claim language, it is possible that the STI regions do not have a width great than about 1 micron, not the active regions as Applicant argues." Claim 34 recites "a plurality of active areas having widths defined by shallow trench isolation regions of no

greater than about one micron, at least some of the widths being different." Applicant's representative informed the Examiner that in fact it is the plurality of active areas having widths of no greater than about one micron, and not the STI regions as stated by the Examiner. Agreement was reached to resolve this issue by amending claim 34 to place a comma between "width" and "defined" such that the claim recites: a "plurality of active areas having widths, defined by shallow trench isolation regions of no greater than about 1 micron."

Additionally, extensive discussions were held regarding the ambiguous teachings of Liaw, U.S. Patent No. 5,960,276. The Examiner refers to the table in col. 4 and Fig. 4 to allegedly teach a correlation between channel widths with different widths having different threshold voltages from one another to reject the pending claims (pg. 3 and 8-9 of paper no. 17). However, Applicant's representative stressed to the Examiner that Liaw teaches two channel width directions that are **perpendicular to one another**, and therefore, the Examiner's reliance on the table in col. 4 and Fig. 4 is flawed. This is more thoroughly explained in Applicant's forthcoming response.

It was agreed that two channel width directions are taught by Liaw. Applicant's representative stated that since Liaw teaches two channel width directions, there are two conflicting theories which can be developed with respect to the teachings of the table and Fig. 4. Applicant's representative further stated that he could present case law authority that states a reference that has ambiguous teachings wherein two conflicting theories might be deduced therefrom

is too indefinite to be utilized as a reference. The Examiner encouraged Applicant's representative to present such authority, and Applicant's representative will do so in his forthcoming response.

Applicant's representative also pointed out that claims 47 and 48 were not presented with any rejections, and Applicant's representative wanted to verify that the claims were allowed so that Applicant's representative could take the allowed claims in an after final response pursuant to 37 CFR §1.116. However, the Examiner was not agreeable to make this verification and stated that this issue would need to be put in the forthcoming response.

Moreover, the Examiner attempted to discuss the new claims 51-54 that were presented in a previous response wherein support for the claims were clearly presented, and yet, the Examiner presented a §112, first paragraph rejection against the new claims without addressing the support presented. The Examiner again stated that we would need to address this issue in the forthcoming response.

Applicant's representative would again like to thank Examiner Schillinger for her time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3-31-04

By: 

D. Brent Kenady
Reg. No. 40,045